

Christ, the Author of Sanctification

JOHN EMERY, O.P.

*Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas
Rome, Italy*

The first name Saint Thomas gives to the Son regarding his Incarnation in the *Summa theologiae* [ST], when describing his visible mission, is *auctor sanctificationis* or “author of sanctification.”¹ This Christological name is rooted in Sacred Scripture and ties in admirably with Aquinas’s Trinitarian teaching. Recent studies have showcased how his Christology and soteriology are imbued with a distinctly Trinitarian character and prolong his Trinitarian theology seamlessly.² No other Christological name conveys this more clearly than “author of sanctification.” Its significance does not stem from its frequent employment in the Thomistic corpus, but from the key place in which it occurs: at the end of the treatment of God, one and three, in the *Prima Pars*, just before the start of the treatment of the divine dispensation outside the Godhead. It is lucidly placed at the nexus of the *theologia* and the *oikonomia* because its very meaning connects them both. In order to read the *Tertia Pars* as the consummation of the “entire theological venture” (ST III, prol.), one requires knowledge of all that precedes it, none more than of the teaching about God, in relation to whom all contents in the *sacra doctrina* are treated (ST I, q. 2, prol.). In its brevity, “author of sanctification” recalls the meaning of the Incarnation from the vantage point of the temporal processions of the Trinity, thus casting the light of the triune God on the distant *Tertia Pars* so that the

¹ ST I, q. 43, a. 7, corp. and ad 4; I-II, q. 101, a. 4, ad 2. For Christ as *principium sanctificationis*, see *In III sent.*, d. 3, q. 5, a. 3, obj. 2.

² See, e.g. Martin Sabathé, *La Trinité rédemptrice dans le Commentaire de l'Évangile de saint Jean par Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris: Vrin, 2011); Dominic Legge, O.P., *The Trinitarian Christology of St Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

student reads it in close connection with the mystery of the Trinity and especially with the divine processions and divine missions. This two-word expression provides in an extremely condensed form the first description of the Incarnation which all of the contents of Saint Thomas's Christology presuppose. Thanks to an acquaintance with the doctrines of the divine missions and the modes of divine presence, the attentive reader can unpack the unexpected theological implications of this denomination so as to better understand the role Christ plays in Aquinas's theology.

Theological Background

In order to grasp the unique traits of the Son's visible mission that are implied in this name, we must first give our attention to Aquinas's usage of the term *auctor* in this context, as it demands further specification.³ To begin with, the Trinitarian meaning of the term should be distinguished from the general sense of the term which is employed in Christology. According to its specifically Trinitarian usage, *auctoritas*—in contrast with the concept of “causality”—designates only the “principle's relation” to that which is originated from it, as well as the fruitfulness implied by this relation;⁴ at the same time, it excludes all connotation of subordination or inferiority in that which proceeds from the principle.⁵ In his commentary on the *Sentences*, Saint Thomas further restricts the meaning of *auctor* by attributing to it the condition of not having a principle in another, which leads him to predicate it properly of the Father with respect to the other two persons.⁶ Hence, the Son is said to be not the author, but “the principle

³ See John Baptist Ku, *God the Father in the Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas*, American University Studies Series 7, Theology and Religion 324 (New York: Peter Lang, 2013), 149–69, 187–93, where the scholar deals with the meaning of *auctor* and *auctoritas* within the Trinity and with respect to the economy.

⁴ *De potentia*, q. 10, a. 1, ad 17: “*Auctoritas* in Patre non est aliud quam *relatio principii*. Secundum relationem autem non dicitur aliquid aequale vel inaequale, sed secundum quantitatem, ut Augustinus dicit [lib. VI *de Trinitate*, cap. IV et lib. V, cap. VI] et propter hoc Filius non est inaequalis Patri.” See Gilles Emery, “Missions invisibles et missions visibles: le Christ et son Esprit,” *Revue thomiste* 106 (2006): 51–99: “It signifies a first origin [origine première], with a note of principal fecundity [fécondité principielle]” (67; see also 64–85). Unless otherwise noted, all translations are original.

⁵ See *Contra errores graecorum* I, chap. 1; *ST I*, q. 33, a. 1, ad 2. In these two texts Aquinas notes that *auctor* was used in this way by the Latin Church Fathers and theologians. See Gilles Emery, *The Trinitarian Theology of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, trans. F. A. Murphy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 158–159, where the scholar points to Hilary as a source of this usage.

⁶ See *In I sent.*, d. 29, q. un., a. 1, corp. (“The name of author [auctoris] adds to the formality

of the Holy Spirit,” or to be, with the Father, “one principle of the Holy Spirit.”⁷ Aquinas’s later works also follow this exclusive attribution to the Father,⁸ although at times, while in the act of “reverently setting forth” (*exponere reverenter*) the teaching of the Church Fathers,⁹ or another authority, he admits a certain attribution of this term to the Son.¹⁰

Beyond this Trinitarian context, the Dominican theologian employs the term to designate God’s unique causality with regard to creatures in such expressions as “author of life” (*auctor vitae*) or “author of goods” (*auctor bonorum*).¹¹ Appropriately, this usage is extended to each of the three persons.¹² The Christological usage of *auctor*, in turn, ascribes a similar signification to the Son in his humanity:¹³ Christ enjoys a preeminent cau-

of principle the fact that it is not from something else, and, therefore, only the Father is called author [auctor], even though the Son is also called principle notionally”); d. 31, q. 2, a. 1, corp.

⁷ In addition to the ending of *In I sent.*, d. 29, q. un., a. 1, corp., see: d. 31, q. 3, a. 2, corp., where the Son is called *principium Spiritus Sancti*; d. 11, q. un., a. 4, ad 3; d. 12, q. un., a. 2, corp. and ad 3; d. 29, q. un., a. 1, where the Son is, with the Father, *unum principium Spiritus Sancti*.

⁸ See *Super Matt* 11, lec. 3, no. 955 (11:25); *Super Ioan* 1, lec. 1, no. 48 (1:1); *ST* III, q. 21, a. 3, corp. and ad 2; q. 48, a. 5, ad 2.

⁹ See *Contra err. graec.* I, prol.

¹⁰ See *Contra err. graec.* II, chap. 23, where, in view of Saint Athanasius’s language, Thomas concedes that the Son is the eternal *auctor* of the Holy Spirit. See also: *ST* I, q. 36, a. 4, obj. 7 and ad 7, where he interprets Saint Hilary’s statement that “[Spiritus Sanctus] a Patre et Filio *auctoribus* confitendus est” in his *De Trinitate* 2.29 (*Patrologia Latina* [PL] 10:69), to mean that the Father and the Son are one sole *auctor*, because he argues that the plural form employed (*auctoribus*) functions as an adjective in this instance; *Responsio de 108 articulis*, q. 27, where John of Vercellis’s twenty-seventh proposition (taken from Peter of Tarantaise’s commentary on the *Sentences*) is made sense of by differentiating the manner in which the Father and the Son can be considered to be *auctor* of the Holy Spirit, i.e., “. . . in quantum Filius hoc habet ab alio, non autem Pater”—“. . . inasmuch as the Son has this from someone [else], while the Father does not.”

¹¹ See *Super 1 Tim* 6, lec. 2, no. 261 (6:13): “Dicit autem ‘Deo,’ qui est tota Trinitas, qui est auctor vitae.” See also *Super II Cor* 1, lec. 2, nos. 9–10 (1:2).

¹² For example, with regard to the Father, see *Super Gal* 1, lec. 1, no. 13 (1:3); *Super Ioan* 7, lec. 3, no. 1065 (7:29); *ST* III, q. 23, a. 2, ad 3. For the Son, see *ST* I, q. 43, a. 7, corp. For the Holy Spirit, see *Super Gal* 6, lec. 2, no. 360 (6:8); *ST* II-II, q. 172, a. 6, ad 1 (see also Ku, *God the Father*, 154–61, 165–69, 189–93). Note that, out of the seven occurrences of the adverb *auctoritative* in Thomas’s corpus, four possess this meaning: *In IV sent.*, d. 3, q. un., a. 2, q. 1, ad 8; *ST* III, q. 8, a. 1, ad 1; q. 26, a. 2, ad 3; q. 27, a. 5, corp. See also Marie-Hélène Deloffre, “Introduction,” in Thomas d’Aquin, *Questions disputées sur la vérité: question XXIX, la grâce du Christ (de gratia Christi)*, trans. M.-H. Deloffre with notes (Paris: Vrin, 2015), 9–148, at 48n3.

¹³ See *Super Rom* 1, lec. 5, no. 87 (1:11); *Super II Cor*, prol., no. 2; *Super II Cor* 13, lec. 3,

salinity with regard to other creatures.¹⁴ The *ST* article on the visible missions suitably takes into account both the Trinitarian and Christological usages of *auctor*:¹⁵ in line with the Trinitarian sense, the Son is called “principle of the Holy Spirit,” whereas, according to the Christological meaning, he is referred to as the “author of sanctification.”¹⁶

The expression “author of sanctification,” which is present in medieval works that precede the thirteenth century,¹⁷ and which Aquinas finds

no. 540 (13:11); *Super Gal* 1, lec. 1, no. 14 (1:4); *Super Heb* 2, lec. 3, nos. 124, 128 (2:9–10); *ST* I, q. 43, a. 7, corp. and ad 4 and ad 6; I-II, q. 101, a. 4, ad 2; q. 114, a. 6, corp.; *Super Ioan* 1, lec. 10, nos. 201–3, 205 (1:16–17); *Super Ion* 6, lec. 3, nos. 897–98 (6:27b); *Super Ioan* 8, lec. 3, no. 1185 (8:26); *Super Ioan* 15, lec. 1, no. 1993 (15:5b). For the Son’s divine authority, see *Super Heb* 8, lec. 1, no. 381 (8:1); *Super Ioan* 17, no. 2254 (17:24).

¹⁴ See *De veritate*, q. 29, a. 5, corp.: “And because Christ bestows [influxit] in some way the effects of grace upon all rational creatures, He is therefore in some way the principle of every grace according to his humanity, just as God is the principle of every act of being [esse].” See also *ST* III, q. 7, a. 9, corp., and a. 11, corp., where Christ is dubbed “universal principle” of grace. Of the three remaining instances of the adverb *auctoritative* in Thomas’s corpus, one obtains this Christological sense: *Super II Cor* 3, lec. 1, no. 83 (3:3). In the other two cases, the term is referred to human authority: *Contra impugnantes*, chap. 7, no. 12, ad 6 (Marietti ed.: chap. 2, no. 346); *Super Rom* 12, lec. 1, no. 955 (12:1). The main source for the Christological usage of *auctor* is found in Scripture: Acts 3:15; Heb 2:10; 12:2 (see notes 18–19 below).

¹⁵ Cf. *Super Ioan* 8, lec. 3, no. 1183 (8:25), where these Trinitarian and Christological senses are applied to *principium*.

¹⁶ *ST* I, q. 43, a. 7, corp. and 4. See Ku, *God the Father*, 161, 191. See also *Summa contra gentiles* [SCG] IV, chap. 55, no. 5. As just mentioned, in his commentary on the *Sentences*, Thomas states that the name “author” applies only to the absolute first principle, so that within the Trinity it only applies to the Father—see *In I sent.*, d. 29, q. un., a. 1, corp.: “Sed nomen auctoris addit super rationem principii hoc quod est non esse ab aliquo; et ideo solus Pater auctor dicitur, quamvis etiam Filius principium dicatur notionaliter” (trans. in note 6 above). However, because within the created genus that enjoys the second mode of divine presence Christ’s humanity has no antecedent cause, he is rightfully called the “author of sanctification.” This expression is akin to Hebrews’ *auctor salutis* (Heb 2:10); among Thomas’s uses of this biblical expression, see especially *Super Isa* 9, lines 117–24 (9:6), where he alludes to the association between *auctor* and paternity while interpreting the Christological name *Pater futuri saeculi*.

¹⁷ See, e.g.: *Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis* [eighth century] (*Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* [CCSL] 159:390–91; PL 74:1071A–B); Peter Damian (†1072), *Carmina sacra et preces* III (“Oratio ad Deum Spiritum sanctum”; PL 145:924A); Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* II, pt. 6, chap. 2 (*De sacramentis Christiane fidei*, ed. R. Berndt, S.J., *Corpus Victorinum, Textus historici* 1 [Frankfurt: Aschendorff, 2008] 380 [lines 13–14]; PL 176:447C–D); Baldwin of Forde (or Canterbury; †1190), *De commendatione fidei* (*Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis* [CCCM] 99 [Sermones: *De commendatione fidei*]; PL 204:616B). Among these citations, only that of Hugh of St. Victor

in some of the ecclesiastical writers he references in his *Catena aurea*,¹⁸ has a solid biblical basis, despite the fact that it is not literally found in Scripture: (1) it is very close to “author” or “principle of salvation” (*auctor salutis*) in Hebrews;¹⁹ (2) the New Testament applies *auctor* to Christ on other occasions as well;²⁰ and (3) it repeatedly teaches that he causes the “sanctification” of or “sanctifies” those who are redeemed.²¹ Furthermore,

refers the expression to Christ; notably, however, the other sources apply it specifically to one of the other divine persons (the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, to the Father; the other two, to the Holy Spirit).

¹⁸ See *Catena aurea in Ioan* 5, lec. 2 (5:15), where Thomas references Saint Augustine’s use of this Christological designation in *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV*, tract. 17; *Catena aurea in Marc* 3, lec. 4 (3:20), which refers to Saint Bede’s recourse to the expression in *In Marci Evangelium Expositio* I, chap. 3; *Catena aurea in Matt* 1, lec. 12 (1:21), which quotes Remigius of Auxerre’s (†908) recurrence to it in *Homiliae Duodecim*, Homily 4. See also *Catena aurea in Matt* 8, lec. 5 (8:16), and *Catena aurea in Matt* 9, lec. 8 (9:37), two quotations of Remigius’s employment of *auctor salutis* that are not found among his extant works.

¹⁹ Heb 2:10 (Vulgate [vg]): “Decebat enim eum, propter quem omnia, et per quem omnia, qui multos filios in gloriam adduxerat, *auctorem salutis* (τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας) eorum per passionem [Sixto-Clementine: consummare] consummari.” Cf. Heb 5:9 (vg): “. . . consummatus, factus est omnibus obtemperantibus sibi, *causa salutis aeternae* [αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου;” cause of eternal salvation”) . . .” Thomas quotes or alludes to Heb 2:10 in *Super Isa* 9, lec. 1 (9:6); *SCG* IV, chap. 34, no. 12; *Super Ioan* 19, lec. 5, no. 2451 (19:30a); *ST* I-II, q. 114, a. 6, corp.; III, q. 9, a. 2, corp.; q. 59, a. 2, ad 2. He also refers to Christ in this way in *Super Heb* 2, lec. 3, nos. 128, 130 (2:10); *Compendium theologiae* [CT] I, chaps. 213, 216–17, 226; *Super Ioan* 4, lec. 2, no. 606 (4:22). Cf. *Super II Cor* prol., no. 2; *CT* II, chap. 3. All told, this biblical expression occurs at least twenty-nine times in twenty-two different places of Thomas’s corpus; in turn, he has recourse to Heb 5:9 on seven occasions, yet only twice with the purpose of referring to Christ’s causality: *Super Matt* 27, lec. 2, no. 2372 (27:42a); *ST* III, q. 22, a. 2, corp. A cursory search of Brepols’s *Library of Latin Texts* and the University of Zurich’s *Corpus Corporum* (PL) reveals that the expression *auctor salutis* is widely used by the Fathers of the Church and later ecclesiastical writers, as well as occurring multiple times in liturgical hymns.

²⁰ Three out of four times, the Vulgate translates ἀρχηγός as *auctor* when referring to Christ, the other two occurrences being Acts 3:15 (*auctor vitae*; ὁ ἀρχηγός τῆς ζωῆς) and Heb 12:2 (*auctor fidei*; τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγός); instead, in Acts 5:31, ἀρχηγός is rendered as *princeps*.

²¹ The noun “sanctification” (ἁγιασμός; *sanctificatio*) is used but once in relation to Christ, in 1 Cor 1:30, where he is said to have become a sanctification for us (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃς ἐγενήθη . . . ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ . . . ἁγιασμός); however, the same teaching is provided by means of the related verb, its active and passive participles, and the corresponding adjective. See John 17:17–19, where Christ speaks of his mission (17:18) as involving that he sanctify himself (ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἑμαυτὸν) in order to sanctify others (ἵνα ὥσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁγιασμένοι) in truth (which is appropriated to him as the eternal Word); 1 Cor 1:2 (ἁγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: those sanctified in Christ Jesus); Eph 1:4 (ἁγίους . . . κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ:

given that Scripture also associates the Holy Spirit with “sanctification,”²² the expression can connote the common agency of the divine persons while sanctifying, as well as the more specific connection between the Son as sanctifying cause and as principle of the Holy Spirit.²³ Hence, one may be persuaded that, contrasted with the expression found in Hebrews, the Christological name “author of sanctification” more clearly points to the Trinitarian context of the Son’s visible mission.²⁴

Revealing the Trinity

The very name “author” accords with the finality of the divine missions of revealing the Trinitarian mystery: the visible sending of the eternal Son reveals that he can be *sent* because he proceeds from the Father, and that he is sent as an *author* inasmuch as he is the principle of the Holy Spirit.²⁵ Instead, it does not appertain to the Father to be sent, since he does not

chosen to be holy in Christ’s presence); 5:26 (ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσῃ: Christ sanctifies the Church, his bride); Heb 2:11 (τε γὰρ ἀγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἀγιαζόμενοι ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες: sanctifier and sanctified have one origin); 9:13–14 (the blood of Christ sanctifies from sin); 10:10 (ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: sanctified by Christ’s offering of his body); 10:14 (μὰ γὰρ προσφορὰ τετέλειωκεν εἰς τὸ διηγεκέσ τοὺς ἀγιάζομένους: Christ’s offering perfects the sanctified); 10:29 (τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ᾧ ἡγιασθή: the [Son of God’s] blood of the covenant that sanctified); 13:12 (Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα ἀγιάσῃ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν λαόν: Jesus sanctifies the people through his blood).

²² Out of the dozen times *sanctificatio* is used in the Vulgate’s version of the New Testament (mostly—nine times—as the translation of ἀγιασμός), on three occasions *sanctificatio* is attributed to the Holy Spirit: Rom 1:4 (“secundum Spiritum sanctificationis”; where it translates ἀγίωσύνη); 2 Thes 2:13; 1 Pet 1:2 (“in sanctificatione Spiritus”). As mentioned in the previous note, the only case in which *sanctificatio* is applied to Christ is 1 Cor 1:30, where the term possesses a sacrificial meaning; see *Super I Cor* 1, lec. 4, no. 71 (1:30), which interprets the passage in light of Heb 13:12 (the other eight occurrences of *sanctificatio* are Rom 6:19, 22 [two times]; 2 Cor 7:1 [where it translates ἀγίωσύνη]; 1 Thes 4:3–4, 7 [three times]; 1 Tim 2:15; Heb 12:10 [where it translates ἀγιότης]).

²³ Their common sanctifying work is suggested in 1 Cor 6:11: “ἡγιασθήτε . . . ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.” See also Rom 15:16, where the apostle’s ministry to Christ is portrayed as an offering up of the Gentiles by the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit (“ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν . . . ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ”); Heb 10:29, where punishment is announced for those who disregard both the Son’s sanctifying (sacrificial) blood (“τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης . . . ἐν ᾧ ἡγιασθή”) and the Holy Spirit in his sanctifying work through grace (“καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος”).

²⁴ Beyond *ST I*, q. 43, a. 7, corp. and ad 4, the expression *auctor sanctificationis* occurs only one other time in Aquinas’s corpus: *ST I-II*, q. 101, a. 4, ad 2; here, it is also applied to Christ, albeit with a sacrificial sense (Thomas has recourse to Heb 13:12 in the response).

²⁵ Cf. *ST III*, q. 3, a. 8, ad 3.

proceed from another divine person; nor does it befit the Holy Spirit to be sent as an author, for he is not the principle of another divine person. Hence, it is because the Son is the only proceeding principle in the Trinity that he is uniquely sent as a principle or author.²⁶

The visible mission of the Son also makes known the eternal processions themselves. This is first by working in and through his humanity what only God can do, since, insofar as he is an “author,” he shows himself to be the eternal Son of God and thus reveals the Father.²⁷ Second, through his work of revelation and instruction, he manifests the manner in which he was eternally begotten by the Father. Thus, the *Sentences* commentary teaches: “Inasmuch as He is the Word, He possesses a congruence with the office of preaching and doctrine [congruentiam habet ad officium praedicationis et doctrinae], because the word manifests the sayer, and He manifested the Father according to John 17:6: ‘Father, I have manifested your name to men.’”²⁸ Third, by giving the Holy Spirit with the Father, in and through his humanity, he brings to light that the third person proceeds from the other two.²⁹ Conversely, knowledge of the eternal processions and of the divine persons ensures that “we judge correctly [ad recte sentiendum] the salvation of the human race which is perfected by the incarnate Son and by the gift of the Holy Spirit.”³⁰

²⁶ This agrees with the Trinitarian and Christological senses of *auctor*, which are present in the careful formulation found in *ST* I, q. 43, a. 7, corp. Reference to the Son as “principle” (*ἀρχή*; *principium*) is also in harmony with one of Origen’s interpretations of John 1:1 and 8:25, according to which the Son himself is designated in this manner. See, e.g., *Super Ioan* 1, lec. 1, nos. 34–35 (1:1a); *Super Ioan* 8, lec. 3, no. 1183 (8:25); cf. *Super Heb* 1, lec. 5, no. 68 (1:10).

²⁷ See *Super Ioan* 5, lec. 6, no. 817 (5:36b); *Super Ioan* 10, lec. 6, nos. 1465–66 (10:38); *Super Ioan* 14, lec. 3, nos. 1887–91 (14:9–10).

²⁸ *In III sent.*, d. q. 1, a. 2, ad 2, corp. See *ST* III, q. 3, a. 8, corp.: “[He] has a special agreement [convenientiam] with human nature, since the Word is a concept of the eternal Wisdom, from whom all the wisdom of human beings is derived. And therefore man makes progress [Piana ed.: is perfected] in wisdom, which is his proper perfection inasmuch as he is rational, by participating in the Word of God, as the disciple is instructed by receiving the word of the master. Hence it is said (Sir 1:5): ‘Fountain of wisdom is the Word of God on high.’ And therefore, for the consummate perfection of man, it was fitting that the Word of God himself should be personally united to human nature.” See also *SCG* IV, chap. 42, nos. 1–3.

²⁹ See *ST* III, q. 3, a. 8, ad 3; *Super Ioan* 20, lec. 4, no. 2538 (20:22).

³⁰ *ST* I, q. 32, a. 1, ad 3: “Cognitio divinarum Personarum fuit necessaria nobis dupliciter. Uno modo ad recte sentiendum de creatione rerum [the knowledge of the divine persons was necessary for us on two counts. First, so that we rightly understand the creation of things. . . . Second, and principally . . .]. . . . Alio modo, et principalius, ad recte sentiendum

Economical Requirements

Saint Thomas states that the goal of the visible missions is to reveal two aspects of grace: its cause and its gratuitous presence. In other words, the visible missions show us the cause and presence of the invisible missions and the second mode of divine presence. The visible mission of the Son manifests the former, while that of the Holy Spirit manifests the latter.³¹ Thus, the Word is sent visibly to manifest a saving causality. As Son, he is the “author” of all the works produced outside the Godhead, inasmuch as he is God. As the *Prima Pars* explains, in order for him to be an “author” according to his visible mission as well, it is requisite that he be capable of working in a preeminent manner according to that which renders him visible. We can count five indispensable requirements of the created effect attached to this visible mission that enable him to be an “author” visibly: (1) its visibility, (2) its agency, (3) its free agency, (4) its participation in that which it causes in others, and (5) the perfection of such a participation. First, it is obvious that, according to the definition (*ratio*) of a visible mission, it is requisite that the created effect of this mission be visible.³² This, of course, precludes the assumption of a nature of a wholly spiritual and immaterial being so as to fulfill this particular mission. Second, it must appertain to the created effect to be such that the divine person itself might be an efficient cause in a creaturely manner.³³ This entails assuming an individual created nature whose agency might be the person’s own agency.³⁴ In his commentary on John, Saint Thomas explains that “the human nature is assumed by the Son of God,” “in the unity of person,” because “the Son appeared, not only as one who manifests, but as a Savior.”³⁵ Put another way, because this agency is both visible and of the divine person, the union between the latter and the humanity that reveals him must be hypostatic. This makes the visible mission of the Son unique among all divine missions insofar as the created effect of the mission subsists in the divine person

de salute generis humani, quae perficitur per Filium incarnatum, et per donum Spiritus Sancti.”

³¹ See SCG IV, chap. 55, no. 5; ST I, q. 43, a. 7, corp. and ad 4.

³² Concerning the need for a visible created effect in order to accomplish the visible mission, see, e.g., ST I, q. 43, a. 7, corp.; *In I sent.*, d. 16, q. un., a. 3, ad 1 and 4–5.

³³ See ST I, q. 43, a. 7, ad 4; *Super Gal* 1, lec. 1, nos. 13–14 (1:3–4); *Super Heb* 2, lec. 3, nos. 127–28 (2:10).

³⁴ See ST III, q. 18, a. 1; q. 19, a. 1.

³⁵ *Super Ioan* 1, lec. 14, no. 270 (1:32): “Columba non est assumpta a Spiritu Sancto in unitatem personae, sicut humana natura assumpta est a Filio Dei. Cuius ratio est, quia Filius apparuit *non solum ut manifestator, sed ut salvator.*”

itself; contrastingly, in the other missions, the created effect either is a created hypostasis or subsists in one. Third, this nature must allow the divine person to be the master of its created operation (“cuius est agere”).³⁶ Now, having rational, voluntary, and free agency pertains exclusively to intellectual creatures, of which only the human being is visible.³⁷ Therefore, a divine person’s own causality is rendered truly visible only through human agency. This is most fitting, as only the most noble of creatures is suited to manifest the divine person, or least unsuited to do so. Fourth, it befits the individual nature assumed by the Son to have the very sanctification it is meant to cause in others.³⁸ This implies that it be a nature capable of being sanctified and united to God, that is, capable of God’s second mode of divine presence.³⁹ This is realized in the intellectual creature by the Trinity’s indwelling, which, in turn, presupposes the invisible missions and grace as their created effect (which is appropriated to the invisible mission of the Holy Spirit).⁴⁰ Thus, the Son’s visible mission surpasses all other visible missions insofar as the assumed created nature itself is the

³⁶ *ST* I, q. 43, a. 7, ad 4: “It was necessary for the person of the Son to be declared as the author of sanctification, as explained above [in corp.], and thus it was necessary that the visible mission of the Son was made *according to the rational nature, to which it is proper to act*, and to which it can pertain to sanctify [Piana ed.: to be sanctified].

³⁷ For the fittingness of the assumption of an *intellectual* nature in the Incarnation, see *SCG* IV, chap. 55, no. 5: “One must also consider that it only pertains to the rational nature to act of itself [soliis rationalis naturae est per se agere] . . . Now, it was becoming [oportuit] that the assumption of a creature by God were of [a creature] such that could act of itself as a principal agent.” For the general fittingness of the assumption of a human nature on the part of the eternal Word, see *SCG* IV, chap. 55; *ST* III, q. 4, a. 1, corp.

³⁸ See *In* III *sent.*, d. 2, q. 1, a. 1, q. 1, ad 2: “A likeness of image is required for the congruousness of the assumability [ad congruitatem assumptibilitatis], because through this [image] the rational creature is a partaker of divine beatitude [particeps est divinae beatitudinis].” See also *SCG* IV, chap. 55, no. 2: “It is not contrary to the order of things that God becomes man, as the first argument set out, because, although divine nature infinitely surpasses human nature, man nevertheless has God for his end according to the order of his nature, and is born to be united to him by his intellect [natus est ei per intellectum uniri];” *ST* III, q. 4, a. 1, corp.: “Human nature, inasmuch as it is rational and intellectual, is born to somehow come into contact with [nata est contingere aliquantulum] the Word himself by its operation, that is, by knowing and loving him.”

³⁹ In this regard, it is fitting that Christ possesses the second mode of divine presence because it is only by receiving this mode of presence that others are saved by him (see, e.g., *ST* III, q. 49, a. 1, ad 5; q. 52, a. 7, corp.; q. 79, a. 7, ad 2).

⁴⁰ See *ST* I, q. 43, a. 3, ad 2; *In* I *sent.*, d. 14, q. 2, a. 1, q. 1, ad 2; q. 2, corp.; Guillermo A. Juárez, *Dios Trinidad en todas las creaturas y en los santos: Estudio histórico-sistemático de la doctrina del Comentario a las Sentencias de Santo Tomás de Aquino sobre la omnipresencia y la inhabitación* (Córdoba, Argentina: Edición del Copista, 2008); Gilles

term of an invisible mission.⁴¹ Fifth, in order to function as a principle of the Holy Spirit's sanctification of other rational beings, the created effect of the visible mission of the Son requires a fullness of that which he will be the principle—sanctification—such that may overflow to others.⁴² In fact, by sending the Holy Spirit to his own humanity,⁴³ the Son sanctifies it in a perfect manner, so that he might become as man what he is as God, to wit, the principle of the sending of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁴ This perfection,

Emery, "L'inhabitation de Dieu Trinité dans les justes," *Nova et Vetera* (French) 88 (2013): 155–84.

⁴¹ See *In I sent.*, d. 16, q. un., a. 1, ad 1: "That visible creature, according to which the mission is said to be visible, behaves [se habet] differently in the Son's visible mission and in the Holy Spirit's visible mission, because in the Son's mission it behaves [se habet] not only as that whereby or wherein the mission is shown, but also as that to which the mission is made [ut ad quod fit missio], since [he] assumed a visible human nature into the unity of the person, according to which assumption [he] is said to have been sent visibly into the flesh." See also d. 15, q. 5, a. 1, q. 4.

⁴² See *In I sent.*, d. 16, q. un., a. 2, corp.: "Unde oportet quod ad missionem visibilem duo concurrant, scilicet quod sit *gratiae plenitudo* in illis ad quos fit missio, et ulterius quod plenitudo ordinetur ad alios, ut per aliquem modum *gratia abundans redundet in eos*"—"Two things must concur for the visible mission [to take place], that is, that a *fullness of grace* be found in those to whom the mission is made, and, furthermore, that [this] fullness be ordered to others, so that in some way *the abounding grace overflows into them*." See also *De ver.*, q. 29, a. 5, corp. ("Sicut in Deo omnis essendi perfectio adunatur, ita in Christo omnis gratiae plenitudo et virtutis invenitur, per quam non solum ipse possit in gratiae opus, sed etiam *alios in gratiam adducere*"—"Just as the perfection of all being is gathered together in God, so is *every fullness of grace and virtue found in Christ*, by which he can, not only [accomplish] the work of grace, but *also lead others into grace*"; *ST III*, q. 7, a. 1, corp. ("Christus enim in quantum homo, est 'mediator Dei et hominum,' ut dicitur 1 Tim. 2, 5. Et ideo oportebat quod haberet *gratiam etiam in alios redundantem*: secundum illud Ioan. 1, 16: "*De plenitudine eius omnes accepimus*, et gratiam pro gratia"—"Christ as man is the 'mediator of God and men,' as 1 Tim. 2:5 says. And hence it behooved [oportebat] him to have a *grace that would also overflow upon others*, according to John 1:16: 'Of His fullness we have all received, and grace upon grace'; a. 9, corp. ("Sic enim recipiebat anima Christi gratiam ut ex ea quodammodo transfunderetur in alios. Et ideo oportuit quod haberet maximam gratiam"—"the soul of Christ received grace so that from it [grace] would somehow be poured out upon others. And hence it behooved [oportuit] him to have the maximal grace").

⁴³ See *ST III*, q. 7, a. 5, ad 2: "Christ is not a recipient and a giver of the gifts of the Holy Spirit according to the same [respect], but rather *gives inasmuch as [he is] God and receives inasmuch as [he is] man*. Hence Gregory says in book II of his *Morals on Job* [chap. 56; *PL* 75:598] that 'the Holy Spirit never abandoned the humanity of Christ, from Whose divinity He proceeded.'"

⁴⁴ See *Super Titus* 3, lec. 1, no. 93 (3:6): "In Christ we find two natures, and *it pertains to both that Christ gives the Holy Spirit*. With regard to the divine [one], because he is the Word, from whom and from the Father as one, he proceeds as Love. Now love in us

which cannot be lost, explains why there is but one invisible mission of the Holy Spirit—and one invisible mission (or quasi-invisible mission) of the Son himself—to the Son's human nature.⁴⁵ It realizes once and for all the end of the Son's humanity—namely, the attainment of beatitude—and it does so in the highest way possible.⁴⁶ This working in his own humanity for the sake of possessing in full, as man, what he will accord to other human beings, is a characteristic trait of the Son's visible mission, one that can be perceived in each of the ways in which his fullness affects the just.

Authoring Our Sanctification

Having established that Christ's visible mission is equipped with all that is required of an author of sanctification, let us now turn our attention to the authoring itself of this sanctification. We propose to discuss four things here: (1) how this author of the divine dispensation unites us to his own author in the Godhead, (2) how this sent author or proceeding principle makes of us proceeding principles, (3) how he causes an invisible sanctification that is inextricably linked to the Holy Spirit, who proceeds

proceeds from a conception of the heart, whose conception is a word. With regard to the human [one], because Christ receives his [the Holy Spirit's] highest *fullness* [summam plenitudinem], so that through him [he] *is derived unto all*." See also *Super I Cor* 15, lec. 7, no. 993 (15:45): "Christ [obtained] the *perfection* of his being, insofar as he was man, *through the Holy Spirit*. And therefore . . . Christ was made a living and life-giving spirit, and thus Christ had life-giving power [potestatem vivificandi]." On Christ giving the Holy Spirit as man, see Legge, *Trinitarian Christology*, 213–23.

⁴⁵ See *In I sent.*, d. 15, q. 5, a. 1, q. 4, corp. ("Others say, and more truly, it would seem, that an invisible mission was made to the soul of Christ at the bestowal of grace that he received at the beginning of his conception, but that *afterward*, no [other] mission to him was made, because no innovation regarding his grace was made"); *ST I*, q. 43, a. 7, ad 6 ("Thus, a visible mission of the Holy Spirit ought to have been made especially to Christ . . . however, in such a manner that the visible mission made to Christ [as an adult] *should demonstrate the invisible mission made to him, not then, but at the beginning of his conception*"). See also *ST III*, q. 39, a. 6, obj. 1 and ad 1; *Super Ioan* 1, lec. 14, nos. 270 and 274 (1:32–33).

⁴⁶ See *ST I*, q. 43, a. 6, ad 3: "the invisible mission is made to the blessed at the very beginning of beatitude. Afterward, however, an invisible mission is made to them, not according to the intensity of grace, but according to some mysteries that are revealed to them in a new way [secundum quod aliqua mysteria eis revelantur de novo], something that occurs up until the day of judgment. Certainly, such an increase is considered according to the extension of grace which extends to many [more objects]. An invisible mission was made to Christ at the beginning of his conception *but not afterwards*, since from the beginning of his conception he was filled with all wisdom and grace."

from him, and (4) how he authors sanctification in a specifically human way with the visible missions of the Holy Spirit.

First, insofar as the Son is a proceeding principle of sanctification, he aims to work in those who accept him as their supernatural principle, in such a way that they are assimilated to his relation to his own principle, the Father. According to the manner in which he proceeds from the Father—that is, by way of an intellectual act—the eternal Word is appropriately called Son and Image. Fittingly, Christ will obtain for the redeemed a participation in his own resemblance to the Father, by fulfilling the image imprinted in them and their calling to adoptive filiation. Thus, inasmuch as he proceeds as the Son, he is sent as the spiritual creature's principle of filiation, or filial adoption;⁴⁷ and, inasmuch as he proceeds as the Father's perfect Image, he is sent as the principle of the realization of the divine image and likeness in this creature.⁴⁸

Second, given that his sending as an "author" is the correlate of his being a proceeding principle of the Holy Spirit, it is most suitable that this mission work to assimilate human beings so that they become a proceeding principle of love in their own participated way. To the extent that the eternal Son receives from the Father "the power to breathe forth (spirate)" the proceeding Love,⁴⁹ he fittingly sanctifies others in his incarnate existence so that they, too, receive the power, or the "fire" (Luke 12:49), to give forth a participated divine love as from a principle, that is, through

⁴⁷ See *In III sent.*, d. 10, q. 2, a. 1, q. 3, corp.; *Super Rom* 8, lec. 6, nos. 704 and 706 (8:29); *SCG* IV, chap. 24, no. 2; *ST* I, q. 33, a. 3, corp. and ad 1; II-II, q. 45, a. 6, corp.; III, q. 3, a. 5, ad 2; a. 8, corp.; q. 23, a. 1, ad 2; a. 2, ad 3; a. 3, corp.; a. 4, corp.; q. 24, a. 3, corp.; q. 45, a. 4, corp. See also *Super Heb* 2, lec. 3, no. 128 (2:10); *Super Ioan* 1, lec. 7, no. 165 (1:14a).

⁴⁸ See *ST* III, q. 5, a. 4, ad 1; *Super Rom* 8, lec. 6, no. 704 (8:29).

⁴⁹ *Super Ioan* 3, lec. 6, no. 543 (3:34b): "Christo, inquantum Deus, dicitur Deus Pater dare Spiritum Sanctum, 'non ad mensuram,' quia *dat ei virtutem et potestatem spirandi Spiritum Sanctum*, qui, cum sit infinitus, in infinitum dat ei Pater: *quem quidem Pater dat ei sicut ipse habet*, ut scilicet sicut ab eo procedit, ita et Filio. Et hoc dedit ei per aeternam generationem. Similiter et Christus, inquantum homo, 'non ad mensuram' habuit Spiritum"—"God the Father is said to give the Holy Spirit 'without measure' to Christ, inasmuch as [Christ] is God, because *he gives him the efficacy and power to breathe forth the Holy Spirit*, to whom, being infinite, the Father gives [this power] infinitely: *this [Spirit] the Father certainly gives to [Christ] just as he himself has [the Holy Spirit]*, that is, so that just as he [the Holy Spirit] proceeds from him so also from the Son. And this he gave him through the eternal generation. Similarly, Christ also as man has the Holy Spirit 'without measure.'" See also *In I sent.*, d. 12, q. un., a. 2, ad 2; q. un., a. 3, ad 1; *De pot.*, q. 10, a. 4, ad 2; *ST* I, q. 36, a. 3, ad 2. See also G. Emery, "Missions invisibles et missions visibles," 80–81.

grace.⁵⁰ Hence, through his visible mission, the Word sanctifies spiritual creatures by conferring upon them grace and knowledge that enable them to love God with a love of charity. As with the eternal Son, this love in spiritual creatures always stems from the power they have from a divine principle. Hence, Aquinas teaches that the invisible mission of the Word “that spirates,” or breathes forth, “love” (*Verbum spirans amorem*), involves a created gift in the spiritual creature that instructs its intellect in such a way that the will bursts forth in a love of friendship for God.⁵¹ Put another way, the spiritual creature is made like the eternal Word as principle of the proceeding Love, through the supernatural knowledge and love of God infused in it.⁵²

⁵⁰ See *Super Rom.* 8, lec. 7, no. 733 (8:39): “The charity of God ‘is in Christ Jesus our Lord,’ that is, it was given to us through him, inasmuch as he gave it to us through the Holy Spirit.” Luke 12:49: “Ignem veni mittere in terram et quid volo nisi ut accendatur?”—“I have come to send fire upon the earth and what do I want but that it be kindled?”

⁵¹ *ST I*, q. 43, a. 5, ad 2 (“Filius autem est *Verbum*, non quaecumque, sed *spirans Amorem*. . . Non igitur secundum quamlibet perfectionem intellectus mittitur Filius, sed secundum talem [Parma ed. adds: *institutionem vel*] *instructionem intellectus, qua prorumpat in affectum amoris*”—The Son is a Word, however, not any sort of word but one that breathes forth Love. . . . Thus, the Son is sent, not according to just any kind of perfection of the intellect, but according to that instruction of the intellect, on account of which it breaks forth into an affection of love”); *In I sent.*, d. 27, q. 2, a. 1, corp. (“Est duplex *verbum*: scilicet rei prolatae quae placet, quod *spirat amorem*, et hoc est *verbum perfectum*”—“There is a twofold word: [first], that of the spoken thing that pleases, which breathes forth love, and this is the perfect word”); *Super Ioan* 6, lec. 5, no. 45 (6:45): “*Verbum* autem Dei Patris est *spirans Amorem*: qui ergo capit illud *cum fervore amoris, discit*; Sap. 7, 27: ‘In animas sanctas se transfert, prophetas et *amicos Dei constituit*’—). In the first of these quotations Thomas has recourse to Saint Augustine’s teaching on the *verbum cum amore notitia* in *De Trinitate* 9.10[15] (see also *De ver.*, q. 4, a. 1, sc 1; a. 3, obj. 3 and ad 3); in the second, he refers to the *verbum perfectum* as necessarily resulting in the will’s act of love (see also *In I sent.*, d. 10, q. un., a. 1, sc 2; d. 15, q. 4, a. 2, corp.: “notitia perfecta”); both of these elements can be found in *In I sent.*, d. 15, q. 4, a. 1, ad 3: “Secundum Philosophum, *Ethic.* VII, 13 et 14, delectatio consequitur operationem perfectam non impeditam. . . . Constat autem quod in processione Verbi aeterni est cognitio perfecta secundum omnem modum, et ideo ex tali notitia procedit amor. Unde dicit Augustinus, *De Trin.* IX, 10: ‘Verbum quod insinuare intendimus cum amore notitia est’ . . . solum tunc habetur similitudo Verbi, quando habetur cognitio talis ex qua procedit amor, qui conjungit ipsi cognito secundum rationem convenientis.” For other related descriptions of this kind of knowledge, see *In I sent.*, d. 14, q. 2, a. 2, ad 3 (“cognitio . . . quasi experimentalis”). See G. Emery, “Missions invisibles et missions visibles,” pp. 56–57; Bernhard Blankenhorn, O.P., *The Mystery of Union with God: Dionysian Mysticism in Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas*, Thomistic Ressourcement 4 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2015), 257–59.

⁵² See Camille de Bello, O.P., *La visite de Dieu: Essai sur les missions des personnes divines*

Third, a consequence of the fact that the eternal Word breathes forth the eternal Love is that their invisible missions follow this order, occur simultaneously, and are inextricably linked.⁵³ This relation between the invisible missions of the Son and the Holy Spirit serves, as it were, as the framework for their visible missions. Indeed, the visible missions of the Holy Spirit manifest the presence of the invisible missions in certain human beings for the benefit of all those who will be the object of the invisible missions.⁵⁴ Likewise, the Son is not sent visibly as a principle of the divine communication that causes the first mode of divine presence, but of the one that corresponds to the invisible missions: the possession or enjoyment of the divine persons by the created persons, and the correlative indwelling and assimilation of the latter by the former. Thus, in and through his humanity, the incarnate Son “gives the Holy Spirit,” insofar as “through him [the Holy Spirit] is derived [derivatur] to all.”⁵⁵ This means that God’s maximal communication in the created order—the hypostatic union—is inherently bound to the enjoyment of the Blessed Trinity on the part of creatures, which is the maximal supernatural communication to a created person. Hence, Aquinas refers to Christ as a principle of the second mode of divine presence in such expressions as: (1) the “principle of grace” (*principium gratiae*⁵⁶ or *auctor gratiae*⁵⁷), that is, of

selon saint Thomas d'Aquin (Geneva: Ad Solem, 2006), 145–46.

⁵³ See *Super Col* 2, lec. 2, no. 97 (2:9); *ST I*, q. 43, a. 5, ad 3.

⁵⁴ See *In I sent.*, d. 16, q. un., a. 2, corp. (“Two things must concur for the visible mission [to take place], that is, that a fullness of grace be found in those to whom the mission is made, and, furthermore, that [this] fullness be ordered to others, so that in some way the abounding grace overflows into them. Thus, the manifestation of the interior grace is not made only to the one who has it but also to others”); *ST I*, q. 43, a. 7, ad 6 (“It is not necessary for an invisible mission that it should always be made manifest through some visible external sign, but, as 1 Cor 12:7 says: ‘the manifestation of the Spirit is given to someone for the common good’ [ad utilitatem], that is, of the Church. Certainly, this common good [utilitas] is that the faith is confirmed and propagated through this type of visible signs. Certainly, this has been done principally by Christ and by the apostles”).

⁵⁵ *Super Titus* 3, lec. I, no. 93 (3:6): “In Christo enim duas naturas invenimus, et ad utramque pertinet, quod Christus *det Spiritum Sanctum*. . . Quantum vero ad humanam, quia Christus accepit summam plenitudinem eius, ita quod *per eum ad omnes derivatur*. Io. 1, 14: ‘Plenum gratiae et veritatis.’ Et Paulo post [v. 16]: ‘Et de plenitudine eius omnes nos accepimus gratiam pro gratia.’ Et cap. 3, 34: ‘Non enim ad mensuram dat Deus Spiritum,’ etc.”

⁵⁶ *De ver.*, q. 18, a. 4, ad 13, sc 3; q. 29, a. 5, corp.; *ST III*, q. 2, a. 11, corp.; q. 27, a. 5, corp. Cf. *ST III*, q. 2, a. 11, corp., where, after designating grace as *merendi principium*, the Incarnation is referred to as *principium gratiae*; thus, in ad 2 the Incarnation is also called *principium merendi*.

⁵⁷ *Super Rom* 1, lec. 5, no. 87 (1:11); *Super Gal* 1, lec. 1, no. 14 (1:4); *Super Col* 1, lec. 4,

the habit infused in the spiritual creature when the invisible missions are present in it;⁵⁸ (2) a principle of glory⁵⁹ (*auctor gloriae*⁶⁰), or a principle of beatitude,⁶¹ that is, of the fullness of the invisible missions;⁶² and (3) a simultaneous principle of both grace and glory, who is therefore fit to guarantee the continuity of the incremental process of the divine missions in a spiritual creature and accompany it.⁶³ Likewise, the incarnate Word also authors the specific gifts associated with the invisible missions. Thus, he is: (1) an “author of faith” (Heb 12:2)⁶⁴ and a principle of supernatural knowledge of God, or of the divine truth, which corresponds to his generation as the eternal Word (“Christ did two things in this world.

no. 29 (1:15); *Super Heb* 2, lec. 3, no. 124 (2:9); *Super Ioan* 1, lec. 10, nos. 201–2 (1:16a); *Super Ioan* 1, lec. 10, no. 203 (1:16b); *Super Ioan* 1, lec. 10, 205 (1:17); *Super Ioan* 15, lec. 1, no. 1993 (15:5b); *ST I*, q. 43, a. 7, ad 6; *III*, q. 7, a. 9, ad 1; q. 27, a. 5, ad 1; q. 37, a. 4, obj. 3; Sermon 8 (“Puer Iesus”), lines 36–39. Cf. *Super Ioan* 6, lec. 3, nos. 897–98 (6:27b), where Christ is referred to as the *auctor . . . cibi spiritualis*; for his designation as *sacramentorum auctor*, see, e.g., *SCG IV*, chap. 72, no. 12; *ST III*, q. 72, a. 1, obj. 4 and ad 4.

⁵⁸ See *ST I*, q. 43, aa. 3 and 5–6.

⁵⁹ See *De ver.*, q. 29, a. 7, corp.; *CT I*, chap. 213; *ST III*, q. 20, a. 1, ad 3; q. 22, a. 5, ad 1; q. 45, a. 1, corp.; a. 3, corp.; a. 4, ad 4. See also *Super I Cor* 15, lec. 3, no. 937 (15:24); *Super Ioan* 13, lec. 6, no. 1830 (13:32); *Super Ioan* 10, lec. 1, no. 1370 (10:2); lec. 3, no. 1398 (10:11a); Sabathé, *La Trinité rédemptrice*, 489 (cf. 418–19). Cf. the Eucharist’s role in leading the redeemed to glory in, e.g., *Super Ioan* 6, lec. 7, no. 974 (6:56).

⁶⁰ *Super I Cor* 2, lec. 2, no. 91 (2:8); *ST III*, q. 53, a. 3, ad 3.

⁶¹ See *Super Ioan* 10, lec. 3, no. 1398 (10:11a): “Nos autem per illum [Christum] intramus, quia per ipsum beatificamur”—“We enter through [Christ] because we are beatified through him.” See also *SCG IV*, chap. 54, nos. 2–5 and 7–9; *De rationibus Fidei* 5 (lines 124–37); *CT I*, chap. 216; *Super Ioan* 8, lec. 8, no. 1271 (8:51); *Super Ioan* 10, lec. 1, no. 1370 (10:2); *Super Ioan* 13, lec. 6, no. 1830 (13:32); *ST I-II*, q. 5, a. 7, ad 2; q. 62, a. 1, corp.; *II-II*, q. 2, a. 7, corp.; *III*, prol.; q. 1, a. 2, corp.; q. 59, a. 2, ad 2. Cf. also *Super Ioan* 15, lec. 2, no. 2004 (15:11); *ST I*, q. 25, a. 6, ad 4; *III*, q. 3, a. 8, corp.; q. 26, a. 1, ad 2; a. 2, corp.

⁶² See *ST I*, q. 43, a. 6, obj. 3 and ad 3. Cf. *Super Ioan* 3, lec. 2, no. 455 (3:8), where the Holy Spirit is portrayed as a principle of beatitude.

⁶³ See *Super Eph* 2, lec. 2, no. 90 (2:7); *Super Eph* 4, lec. 3, no. 206 (4:8); *ST III*, q. 8, a. 3, corp.; a. 4, ad 2; q. 45, a. 4, corp. and ad 3. See also *Super I Cor* 15, lec. 7, no. 998 (15:49); *Super Col* 1, lec. 5, no. 48 (1:18); *Super Heb* 3, lec. 3, no. 189 (3:14); *Super Ioan* 17, lec. 2, no. 2196 (17:6); *ST I-II*, q. 114, a. 6, corp. Cf. *ST III*, q. 60, a. 3, corp. and ad 1.

⁶⁴ This involves two “instructions”: *Super Heb*. 12, lec. 1, no. 664 (12:2): “Ipse enim est auctor fidei dupliciter. Primo eam *docendo* verbo. . . . Secundo eam in corde *imprimendo*”—“He is the author of faith in a twofold manner: first, by teaching it by word. . . . Second, by imprinting it on the heart.” See also Bruno Drilhon, O.S.B., who takes note of the affinity that exists between Thomas and Alexander of Hales concerning this teaching (*Dieu missionnaire: Les missions visibles des Personnes divines selon saint Thomas d’Aquin*, Croyre et Savoir 55 [Paris: Têqui, 2009], 79–86).

First, he taught the truth, by inviting and calling [us] to faith. . . . Second, he consummated truth itself by opening for us the door of life through his passion, [thus] giving [us] the power to come fully [potestatem perveniendi] to the consummated truth”);⁶⁵ (2) a principle of a love based on spiritual or intellectual knowledge, namely, charity: “through him [Christ], . . . we receive the movement of charity [motum caritatis];”⁶⁶

⁶⁵ *Super Ioan* 6, lec. 4, no. 641 (6:34). See *ST* III, q. 3, a. 8, corp.: “Per hoc homo in sapientia perficitur. . . . quod participat Verbum Dei. . . . Conveniens fuit ut per Verbum verae sapientiae homo reduceretur in Deum, qui per inordinatum appetitum scientiae recesserat a Deo”—“man is perfected in wisdom . . . by participating in the Word of God . . . it was fitting for man to be brought back to God [reduceretur in Deum] by [per] the Word of true wisdom, [since man] withdrew from God through [per] the inordinate appetite of science” (more of this passage is quoted in note 28 above). See also *In I sent.*, d. 15, q. 4, a. 1, corp.; *ST* I, q. 43, a. 5, ad 1–2; II-II, q. 1, a. 8, ad 5. These passages show that the mission of the Son is the principle of spiritual creatures’ supernatural knowledge of God, i.e., of that “wisdom” which is a supernatural likeness of his eternal generation. Note that the eternal Word’s generation is also the principle of natural knowledge of God (and of all other knowledge).

⁶⁶ *In III sent.*, d. 13, q. 2, a. 1, corp. See *Super Rom* 8, lec. 7, no. 725 (8:37) (“He gives the answer, saying, ‘but in all these things,’ namely, the evils I put above, ‘we overcome,’ as long as we preserve our *charity* unblemished. Wis 10:12: ‘she gave him a strong battle so that he would vanquish.’ And this not by our own power [virtute] but through Christ’s help; hence he says, ‘because of him who has loved us,’ that is, because of his help, or because of the affection we have for him; ‘not as though we’ first ‘loved him,’ but because he first ‘loved us,’ as is said in 1 John 4:19, and 1 Cor 15:57: ‘thanks be to God, who has given us the victory through Jesus Christ’”); *Super Ioan* 21, lec. 2, no. 2599 (21:9) (“The embers of charity [prunas caritatis]. . . . Christ brought these embers from heaven to earth: [thus], in John 13:34 above: ‘a new commandment I give unto you: that you love one another; and again, in Lk 12:49: ‘I came to cast fire upon the earth.’”); lec. 3, no. 2617 (21:15a) (“As the Lord was dying, Peter was afraid and denied [him]; but rising again the Lord instilled love [amorem inseruit] and cast out fear”). This last passage is, in fact, a quotation from Augustine, which is reprised in a slightly more accurate manner in *Catena aurea in Ioan* 21, lec. 3 (21:15); see Augustine of Hippo, Sermon 12 (“De eo quod dicit in Evangelio: Simon Iohannis, diligis me?”), no. 1 (*PL* 46:852). See also *Super Ioan* 8, lec. 5, no. 1234 (8:42a); *Super Ioan* 13, lec. 7, no. 1836 (13:34); *Super Ioan* 17, lec. 6, no. 2270 (17:26b); *Super Ioan* 20, lec. 4, no. 2537 (20:21). Cf. *Super Ioan* 6, lec. 2, no. 877 (6:17b); *Super Ioan* 6, lec. 6, no. 950 (6:47); *Super Ioan* 15, lec. 1, nos. 1992–93 (15:5b). For the Eucharist as a principle of charity, see *ST* III, q. 79, a. 1, ad 2; a. 4, corp.; a. 8, corp. and ad 2 (cf. q. 75, a. 1, corp.). For Christ as the principle involved in God’s special love for us that corresponds to the second mode of divine presence, see, e.g., *Super Eph* 1, lec. 2, no. 16 (1:6b); *Super Ioan* 17, lec. 5, no. 2251 (17:23) (“Dilectio qua dilexisti me [Christus], est ratio et causa quare eos dilexisti”—“The love with which you have loved me [Christ], is the reason and cause why You have loved them”). On God as the principle of charity, see *Super Ioan* 10, lec. 4, no. 1422 (10:17); *Super Ioan* 14,

or divine friendship,⁶⁷ which, again, expresses his intellectual generation as a “spirating” Word, from whom the personal divine Love proceeds;⁶⁸ and (3) a principle of sanctification,⁶⁹ or of the ensemble of grace, knowledge, and love, which also points to the Holy Spirit’s procession from him (and the Father).⁷⁰ As mentioned above it is most fitting that Christ possess the maximum of these perfections of which he is sent to be a principle (human and supernatural knowledge of God, sanctification and love).⁷¹

lec. 5, no. 1934 (14:21); *Super Ioan* 15, lec. 2, no. 2002 (15:10a); *Super Ioan* 15, lec. 3, nos. 2011–12 (15:13b).

⁶⁷ See *SCG IV*, chap. 54, no. 6 (“Thus, so that a more familial friendship [familiarior amicitia] might exist between man and God, it was expedient for man that God should become man”); *Super Ioan* 15, lec. 2, no. 2009 (15:13a): “Christus non posuit animam suam pro nobis inimicis, ut scilicet inimici remaneremus, sed ut amicos efficeret” — “Christ did not put [down] his life for us [His] enemies, that is, so that we remain enemies, but so that He make us friends”). Cf. *ST III*, q. 26, a. 1, ad 2.

⁶⁸ See, e.g., *Super Rom* 8, lec. 7, no. 733 (8:39): “This charity of God is ‘in Christ Jesus our Lord,’ that is, because it was given to us through Him, inasmuch as He gave it to us through the Holy Spirit. Luke 12:49: ‘I came to cast fire upon the earth and what do I will but that it be kindled?’”; *Super Ioan* 2, lec. 1, no. 347 (2:3): “The wine of charity was failing [vinum caritatis deficiebat] there: because they had received only the spirit of servitude in fear. But Christ converted the water of fear into the wine of charity when he gave ‘the Spirit of adoption of sons, in which we cry, Abba, Father,’ as is said in Rom 8:15, and when ‘the charity of God was poured out into our hearts,’ as is said in Rom 5:5.” See also *Super Rom* 12, lec. 2, no. 974 (12:5). For the “soteriological stakes of the *Filioque*,” see Gilles Emery, O.P., “The Procession of the Holy Spirit *a Filio* according to St. Thomas Aquinas,” trans. H. Buttery, in *Trinity in Aquinas* (Ypsilanti, MI: Sapientia Press, 2003), 213–15; G. Emery, “Biblical Exegesis and the Speculative Doctrine of the Trinity in St. Thomas Aquinas’s Commentary on St. John,” trans. Matthew Levering, in *Trinity in Aquinas* 290–92; Sabathé, *La Trinité rédemptrice*, 507n1.

⁶⁹ In addition to the citations provided in notes 1, 32, and 34 above, see *ST III*, q. 4, a. 4, ad 1: “universal cause of human salvation.” It should be noted that “sanctification,” and especially “salvation,” also connote a negative sense, i.e., the deliverance from an adverse situation; for a passage combining both the positive and negative aspects of this “sanctification,” see, e.g., *Super I Cor* 1, lec. 4, no. 71 (1:30): “As to the defect of nobility he says, ‘and sanctification and redemption.’ In fact, we are sanctified by Christ, inasmuch as through Him we are conjoined to God, in which [state] true nobility consists.” Cf. *Super II Cor* 13, lec. 3, no. 540 (13:11), where Christ is identified as *Deus pacis*, and *auctor pacis*.

⁷⁰ See *Super Ioan* 7, lec. 5, no. 1090 (7:38): “The one who drinks by believing in Christ draws from the fountain of water . . . Here the fountain from which one draws is the Holy Spirit . . . Hence, because the Apostle was moved by the instinct and fervor of the Holy Spirit, he said [‘the charity of Christ impels us’], and Rom 8:14: ‘those who are driven by the Spirit of God, these are children of God.’”

⁷¹ See John Emery, O.P., “Aquinas’s Use of the Principle of the Maximum in His Christology,” *The Thomist* 89 (2025), forthcoming.

Fourth, Christ is sent visibly as an author of sanctification in order to benefit other human beings. He does so by authoring this sanctification in a way that is conducive to their salvation. The Holy Spirit's visible missions cooperate with the incarnate Son in disclosing how this comes about. In this regard, the *Prima Pars* reprises the teaching that the Holy Spirit is sent visibly upon Christ during his baptism and transfiguration to show that Christ is the source of the grace of regeneration (Matt 3:17) and of true doctrine (17:5).⁷² Here, the visible missions of the Holy Spirit work in unison with that of the Son so as to lay the foundation for the revelation of Christ's multiple saving causalities, each of which contributes to make our sanctification more human and more divine, more a gift and more our own.⁷³ Thus, when the visible missions of the two divine persons that are sent coalesce, they manifest the overflowing of grace from the incarnate Word "through instruction and through operation," since "both modes of overflowing are found in Christ."⁷⁴ One can also say that Christ's fullness of truth overflows to others by way of instruction or example, while his superabundance of grace does so through his actions, be it as an instrumental efficient cause, or as a meritorious one, itself a basis for his satisfaction, sacrifice, and redemption. The Johannine dyad of truth and grace (John 1:14, 17) summarizes the soteriological work of Christ among human beings because human salvation involves God's gratuitous gift and man's free cooperation. In fact, grace is infused in us to elicit our

⁷² See *In I sent.*, d. 16, q. un., a. 3, corp.; *ST I*, q. 43, a. 7, ad 6: "Facta autem est missio visibilis ad Christum in baptismo . . . ad ostendendum in Christo *auctoritatem donandi gratiam* per spiritualem regenerationem. . . . In transfiguratione vero . . . ad ostendendam *exuberantiam doctrinae*. . . . Ad Apostolos autem, sub specie flatus, ad ostendendam *potestatem ministerii in dispensatione Sacramentorum* . . . Sed sub linguis igneis, ad ostendendum *officium doctrinae* . . ." These passages reveal that Thomas's schema of four visible missions of the Holy Spirit is structured according to the combination of two sets of soteriological categories: (1) grace and truth; (2) Head and ministers of the Church.

⁷³ For a brief presentation, see John Emery, O.P., "Aquinas's Christology of Communication," in *Thomas Aquinas and the Crisis of Christology*, ed. M. A. Dauphinais, A. Hofer, O.P., and R. W. Nutt (Ave Maria, FL: Sapientia Press, 2021), 171–94.

⁷⁴ *In I sent.*, d. 16, q. un., a. 3, corp.: "Now, grace *overflows* in a twofold manner, that is, *through instruction and through operation*, insofar as he in whom the fullness of grace is [found] in a certain way behaves [se habet] efficiently with regard to grace [efficienter ad gratiam]. Now, *both modes of overflowing were [found] in Christ*. Indeed, he led us to the knowledge of God through his doctrine, as is said in John 1:18: 'The only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he himself has made known.' He has also given grace efficiently [effective] as God and by mode of merit as man." See also *Super Ioan* 1, lec. 8, no. 186 (1:14c). While these texts do not refer explicitly to Christ's instrumental efficient causality, Aquinas's teaching elsewhere (e.g., *ST III*, q. 48, a. 6) develops this doctrine.

cooperation with it, but only knowledge of the truth enables us to cooperate with it freely. Conversely, truth is given to us so that we can work our own salvation, but we cannot do so without the help of grace.

“You Are the Most Handsome of Men” (Ps 45[44]:2)

Having shown the soteriological implications of the name “author of sanctification,” a question remains as to the incarnate Word’s place within the saving dispensation. There is little difficulty in admitting that the effects included in the other missions—“wisdom,” charity, and the visible manifestations of the Holy Spirit—are ordered to the good of rational creatures.⁷⁵ However, applying this to Christ requires careful elucidation, lest one fall into a subordination of the person of the incarnate Son to the salvation of mankind. Here, two aspects must be reconciled: (1) as stated in the Nicene Creed, God orders the Incarnation to the benefit of others: “for us men and for our salvation” (“propter nos homines, et propter nostram salutem”); (2) not only does the goodness of the divine person exceed all created goodness, but the goodness of the Son’s humanity—and the love God has for it—is also greater than that of all other creatures, even when taken as a whole.

The harmony between these two truths can be discerned by considering God’s love, whose only proportionate object is God himself; all other things are loved by God inasmuch as he “communicates,” “diffuses” (*diffundit*), and “makes others participate in” his goodness.⁷⁶ This implies that the love God has for other things derives from the love he has for himself, or is ordered to the love he has for his own goodness as to its end.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ For the supernatural effects that accompany the invisible missions see *In I sent.*, d. 15, q. 4, a. 1, corp.; *ST I*, q. 43, a. 5, sc and ad 2. “Wisdom” in this context should not be equated outright with the gift of the Holy Spirit of the same name; rather, it is a supernaturally infused likeness of the procession of the eternal Word in the intellect of the spiritual creature, which is the creaturely correlate of the Son’s invisible mission; as such, it perfects the created intellect so that it comes to know God supernaturally, i.e., as God knows himself.

⁷⁶ *ST I*, q. 19, a. 2, corp.: “God wills not only himself but also other things than himself. . . . In fact, a natural thing has a natural inclination not only with regard to its own good . . . but also to spread [*diffundat*] its own good to others. . . . Hence, we see that every agent, inasmuch as it is in act and is perfect, makes something similar to itself. . . . Much more does it pertain to the divine will that it *communicate* [*communicet*] its good to others by likeness as much as it is possible. . . . It also befits the divine goodness that other things *participate* in it.”

⁷⁷ *ST I*, q. 19, a. 2, corp.: “[God] wills himself to be and also other things [to be]. However,

In other words, God's love of self and his goodness are the reason for the love and goodness of everything else.⁷⁸ However, God orders everything to his goodness, not as something to be acquired, but as something to be communicated to others, since God's only intent in acting in the created order is to "communicate his perfection" and "his goodness."⁷⁹

God's love for all things is the same insofar as he loves everything in himself and for his own goodness with the same love; nonetheless, he effectively loves more a creature that participates more perfectly in his goodness.⁸⁰ In addition to each being's own degree of goodness, God establishes an order among the things he loves for his goodness. This order is not necessarily subject to the end-means relation, as God does not require means to achieve an end. Indeed, because God is the universal primary cause who is able to work in the created order with or without secondary causes, when he orders a secondary cause to act, he is in fact conferring a greater perfection on this agent. Therefore, it is fitting that God bestow his goodness upon certain creatures through other ones that are in some way more perfect than the recipients. The greater participation in his goodness that God communicates to these creatures is twofold, since it comprises, on the one hand, their ability to communicate to other creatures a participation in divine goodness, and on the other, a specific perfection they possess that enables them to realize such a communication.⁸¹ Even though the

[he wills] himself [to be] as end, instead, [he wills] the other things [to be] as [ordained] to the end, inasmuch as it also befits the divine goodness that other things participate in it." See also *ST* I, q. 19, a. 2, ad 2: "Given that God wills things other than himself only for the sake of the end that is his own goodness, as mentioned above, it does not follow that anything else moves his will, except his goodness. And thus, just as he understands things other than himself by understanding his own essence, so also he wills things other than himself by willing his own goodness."

⁷⁸ Cf. *ST* II-II, q. 132, a. 1, ad 1: "Deus suam gloriam non quaerit propter se, sed propter nos"—"God does not seek his glory for himself, but for us."

⁷⁹ *ST* I, q. 44, a. 4, corp.: "Primo agenti, qui est agens tantum, non convenit agere propter acquisitionem alicuius finis; sed intendit solum *communicare suam perfectionem*, quae est *eius bonitas*"—"It does not befit the first agent, who is agent only, to act for the acquisition of some end; rather, He intends only to *communicate* [communicare] *His perfection*, which is *His goodness*."

⁸⁰ See *ST* I, q. 20, a. 3, corp.: "[1] On the part of his very act of willing, . . . God does not love some more than others, because he loves all things according to an act of the will that is one and simple. . . . [2] On the part of the very good that someone wills to the beloved; . . . thus we say that we love someone to whom we will a greater good more than another. . . . It is necessary to say that God loves some more than others in this way."

⁸¹ Scripture, of course, abundantly witnesses to God associating others in his communication, by implying that they receive both a given quality and the capacity to collaborate

more perfect creature is in this way ordered to the less perfect one, this does not diminish the former, but rather enhances it:⁸² by investing them with the power to communicate, God “ennobles” and dignifies the intermediate causes that he chooses to employ in the conferral of his perfections upon other creatures, since they imitate his own generous communication.⁸³ Indeed, this is firstly verified in God himself, who “bestows [communicat] his goodness upon creatures in such a way that nothing is subtracted from him; rather, he is in some way exalted.”⁸⁴

The visible mission of the Son is also ruled by this law of divine communication. Moreover, the Incarnation realizes it maximally, since the sending of the Son in the flesh—involving the union of an individual human nature to the Son’s divinity in his very person—is the maximal communication of the divine goodness, to the extent that it is possible for a creature to receive it.⁸⁵ Thus, while stating—and echoing the explicit teachings of Sacred Scripture—that the reason (*ratio*) of the Incarnation is “assigned to it from the first man’s sin,”⁸⁶ Saint Thomas is well aware that the Son’s “excellence is not undone by the fact that God gave him up to death for the salvation of the human race [humani generis].”⁸⁷ On the contrary, “the fact that Christ was given up for human beings, resulted in a maximal good

in its communication to others; see, e.g., Matt 14:16; Mark 6:37; Luke 9:13 (“You give them something to eat”); Matt 5:16–19 (“You are the salt”; “you are the light”); Matt 10:8 (“You have received gratuitously, give gratuitously”).

⁸² Cf. *ST* I, q. 105, a. 5, corp., where Thomas teaches that it is the imperfect that is *propter* the more perfect, and not the other way around.

⁸³ See *Super Ioan* 1, lec. 4, no. 119 (1:7): “Ad *nobilitandas* ipsas causas medias [Deus] eis causalitatis dignitatem communicare dignatur”—“In order to *ennoble* the very middle causes, [God] deigns to communicate to them the dignity of causality.”

⁸⁴ *SCG* IV, chap. 34, no. 22: “Deus sic suam bonitatem creaturis communicat quod nihil ei subtrahitur, sed magis quodammodo exaltatur.”

⁸⁵ See *ST* III, q. 1, a. 1, corp., Fernando Ocariz, Lucas F. Mateo-Seco, and José A. Riestra present the Incarnation in terms of communication and friendship, and as the supreme and most intimate divine communication, which reveals God’s infinite capacity to communicate (*El misterio de Jesucristo*, 3rd ed., *Manuales de Teología* 13 [Pamplona: EUNSA, 2004], 121–22, 124, 126–27, 131–32, 515).

⁸⁶ *ST* III, q. 1, a. 3, corp.: “Cum in Sacra Scriptura ubique *incarnationis ratio ex peccato primi hominis assignetur*, convenientius dicitur incarnationis opus ordinatum esse a Deo in remedium peccati, ita quod peccato non existente, incarnatio non fuisset. Quamvis potentia Dei ad hoc non limitetur; potuisset enim, etiam peccato non existente, Deus incarnari.” See also *SCG* IV, chap. 55, no. 6. For examples of the scriptural passages alluded to here, see Matt 1:21; Luke 19:10; 1 Tim 1:15, to which Thomas turns in *ST* III, prol., and q. 1, a. 3, corp.

⁸⁷ *ST* I, q. 20, a. 4, ad 1: “Nec eius excellentiae deperiit ex hoc quod Deus dedit eum in mortem pro salute humani generis, quinimo ex hoc factus est victor gloriosus.”

for Christ himself.”⁸⁸ The criticism of this traditional theological opinion shared by Saint Thomas—that redemption from sin is the reason for the Incarnation (a deviation famously advocated by Duns Scotus, but shared by some who came before him, and many who followed him)—hinges on the view that all events, including those ordered by God, are subject to finality.⁸⁹ On these terms, the Incarnation would either be the end sought by God for his dispensation among creatures, or it would be conditioned by some other created reality as to its end. As a result, any ordering of Christ to something else—for instance, as an author of the sanctification of others—would be considered detrimental to his perfection. This pre-supposed alternative, however, proves false.

As Scripture clearly attests, God can order someone to be at the service of others (Mark 10:45), to look for those who are lost (Luke 19:10), or to be as a physician to those who suffer from an ailment (Matt 9:12), without supposing a relation of subordination.⁹⁰ There is no contradiction between the Word as incarnate being at the service of humanity (Matt 20:28) and

⁸⁸ *In III sent.*, d. 32, q. un., a. 5, q. 4, ad 1: “in hoc etiam quod Christus pro hominibus fuit datus, maximum bonum ipsi Christo fuit, secundum quod in hoc virtus sua manifesta fuit et causa fuit salutis humanae: quod est sibi valde honorificum.” Cf. *ST* III, q. 5, a. 4, obj. 2 and ad 2, where God’s maximal communication is shown to preclude a hypothetical universalization of the third mode of divine presence (the hypostatic union) to all individual human natures; instead, the maximal divine communication implies the incarnate Son’s collaboration in the communication of the second mode of divine presence to created persons.

⁸⁹ See François Daguet, *Théologie du dessein divin chez Thomas d’Aquin: Finis omnium Ecclesia*, Bibliothèque thomiste 54 (Paris: Vrin, 2003), 191–239; in this lucid and thorough study of the “motif de l’incarnation du Verbe,” the scholar shows that, in addition to Scotus, Rupert of Deutz [†1129/30], Honorius of Autun [†1154], Scotus’s followers, and many Thomists—starting with the Carmelite “Salmanticenses” (seventeenth Century)—are also concerned about the relationship of finality between the Incarnation and redemption: “Duns Scotus intended to manifest the primacy of Christ in himself. Many Thomists believe they can respond to him based on the primacy of Christ willed as redeemer” (217). Jean-Miguel Garrigues, *Le dessein divin d’adoption et le Christ Rédempteur: À la lumière de Maxime le Confesseur et de Thomas d’Aquin* (Paris: Cerf, 2011), 63–87, is another fine analysis of this issue. Both Daguet and Garrigues accord great importance to *De ver.* q. 29, a. 4, ad 3, in this context. See also Richard Cross, *Duns Scotus*, Great Medieval Thinkers (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 127–29, 203–4; Marie-Vincent Leroy, O.P., “La convenance de l’Incarnation,” *Revue thomiste* 109 (2009): 419–465, esp. 447–53; Philippe-Marie Margelidon, O.P., *Jésus Sauveur: Christologie* (Paris: Parole et Silence, 2014), 186–189.

⁹⁰ See Daguet, *Théologie du dessein divin*, 222: “Such a statement on the absence of causality in God and on the willing the order of a means to the end exempts Saint Thomas from any reproach of anthropomorphism.”

the maximal divine love and created goodness he enjoys.⁹¹ On the contrary, this role as a servant that the Son fulfills in and through his humanity requires that it be more perfect than any other spiritual creature, since “the cause is superior to what it causes.”⁹² Thus, given that serving others in this way both requires and results in Christ’s maximal perfection and ennoblement, the service he performs cannot be interpreted to signify that the Incarnation is a mere means to an end.⁹³ Instead, in accordance with Aquinas’s teaching, it should be conceived of as the highest divine communication, such that it involves two perfections: (1) that of the Son’s humanity itself, and (2) that of the communicating activity he fulfills.

Ultimately, all works outside (*ad extra*) the Trinity are ordered to its glory, that is, not to the growth of divine glory in itself, but to “the manifestation of [God’s] goodness,”⁹⁴ and “to propagate God’s glory in human

⁹¹ See *ST* I, q. 20, a. 4, ad 1; *In* III *sent.*, d. 32, q. un., a. 5, q. la. 4, corp.

⁹² *In* III *sent.*, d. 32, q. un., a. 5, q. la. 4, ad 2: “causa praestantior est causato.” See also *In* IV *sent.*, d. 38, q. 2, a. 2, q. la. 1, ad 3; d. 41, q. un., a. 1, q. la. 1, ad 1; *De ver.* q. 11, a. 1, obj. 2; *SCG* I, chap. 41, no. 4; III, chap. 77, no. 6; chap. 120, no. 18; *De spir. creat.* q. 11, a. 11; *De malo*, q. 1, a. 5, obj. 6; q. 7, a. 8, corp.; *ST* I, q. 45, a. 8, obj. 2; q. 60, a. 4, obj. 2; q. 67, a. 3, obj. 3; q. 95, a. 1, corp.; q. 115, a. 1, obj. 5; I-II, q. 4, a. 2, sc; q. 48, a. 2, obj. 1; q. 66, a. 1, corp.; q. 66, a. 6, obj. 3 and ad 3; q. 71, a. 3, obj. 3; q. 77, a. 8, obj. 2 (the Leonine and Piana editions contain an obvious erroneous transposition between “cause” and “effect”); q. 112, a. 1, corp.; II-II, q. 26, a. 3, obj. 1; q. 32, a. 4, obj. 1; q. 34, a. 2, ad 2; q. 104, a. 3, obj. 2; q. 105, a. 2, obj. 3; q. 148, a. 3, obj. 2 and ad 2; q. 153, a. 2, obj. 3; q. 153, a. 3, sc 1; III, q. 9, a. 2, corp.; q. 54, a. 2, corp.; q. 77, a. 3, obj. 3; *Super Heb* 7, lec. 4, no. 370 (7:25), which employs *potentior*; *In* VI *eth.*, lec. 3, no. 1149; *Exp. Poster. Anal.* 1, VI, lines 45–55 (4, no. 56); *De perf. spir. vitae* 20, lines 28–35 (nos. 17, 658). Note the extraordinary increase in the use of this metaphysical expression from the commentary on the *Sentences* (two occurrences) to the *Summa theologiae* (twenty-five occurrences).

⁹³ See Leroy, “La convenance,” 426–28, 441–57; esp. 452: “It would be perverse and absurd to order the superior [Incarnation] to the inferior [redemption] as to an end or as to a principle of perfection. But it is by no means so to order the superior to the inferior as to a subject capable of being perfected by it.” Cf. *SCG* IV, chap. 42, no. 1: “Assumptio naturae humanae ad salutem hominum *ordinatur*” — “The assumption of a human nature is ordered to the salvation of human beings.” See also *CT* I, chap. 213: “The end of the assumption of a human nature on the part of the Word of God is the salvation and reparation of human nature; thus, Christ had to be of such a kind according to his human nature that he could fittingly be the author of human salvation.”

⁹⁴ *ST* I-II, q. 114, a. 1, ad 2: “Deus ex bonis nostris non quaerit utilitatem, sed *gloriam*, idest *manifestationem suae bonitatis*; quod etiam ex suis operibus quaerit. Ex hoc autem quod eum colimus, nihil ei accrescit, sed nobis.” See *Super Eph* 1, lec. 4, no. 35 (1:12): “Laus autem gloriae Dei, ut dicit Ambrosius, est cum multi acquiruntur ad fidem, sicut gloria medici est cum multos acquirat et curat.”

beings.⁹⁵ This is the closest thing to an increase of God's own glory, since, as Aristotle teaches, that which one experiences and does through a friend is closest to what one is and to what one experiences directly.⁹⁶ God's communication aims at having *others* participate as friends in his own life of knowledge and love of his essence. Although Christ's humanity does not constitute another friend, it allows the Son to be involved in a new way in the dispensation of these communications. Thus, just as God's purely generous bestowal of his communications on others contributes to his glory, so the cooperation of the Son's humanity with this dispensation as author of sanctification contributes all the more to its perfection.

Conclusion

The name "author of sanctification" the Son obtains according to his visible mission is solidly based on scriptural and patristic teachings and enables Aquinas to evoke the doctrine of the Trinity in the context of the divine dispensation: a sent author of sanctification is a divine person who has an origin in another and is a principle of another within the Trinity. The fact that he is sent as such an author determines the individual created nature he assumes, one that allows him to act as a free agent, and the sanctification he receives, one that is plenteous and fontal but homogeneous to this created nature. This Christological name fully agrees with the order of the processions and missions: as Son and Image, Christ is sent to assimilate others to himself through his humanity, and as Word that spirates Love,

⁹⁵ *ST* II-II, q. 83, a. 9, ad 1: "Sicut Augustinus dicit, in libro *De Serm. Dom. in Monte* [2, 5 (*PL* 34:1277)]: 'cum dicimus, "sanctificetur nomen tuum," non hoc petitur quasi non sit sanctum Dei nomen, sed ut sanctum ab hominibus habeatur'; quod pertinet *ad Dei gloriam in hominibus propagandam*." See also *Super Eph* 1, lec. 1, no. 13 (1:6a): "When it is said that God wills and does everything for his own goodness, this does not mean [non intelligitur] that he does something for a goodness that he communicates to himself [propter bonitatem sibi communicandam], but rather for a goodness that he spreads to others [propter bonitatem in alios diffundendam]. Now, the divine goodness is properly communicated to a rational creature so that the rational creature itself knows it. And, therefore, everything that God does in rational creatures he creates for his own praise and glory, according to Isa 43:7, 'everyone who calls upon my name, I have created for my glory,' that is, so that he comes to know goodness, and by knowing [it] comes to praise it. And, thus, the Apostle adds 'for the praise of the glory of his grace,' that is, that he comes to know how much God ought to be praised and glorified."

⁹⁶ See *Nicomachean Ethics* 9.9.1169b30–1170a4; *In IX eth.*, lec. 10, no. 1896. For the finality of God's communication as the bestowal of his glory, see *In III sent.*, d. 1, q. 1, a. 1, ad 2; *Super Rom* 8, lec. 6, no. 76 (8:29); *ST* I, q. 44, a. 4, corp. (quoted in note 81 above); *III*, q. 23, a. 1, ad 2.

he is sent to be a principle of the Holy Spirit as man. The visible mission of the Son is thus at the center of the dispensation worked by the divine missions, something that the visible missions of the Holy Spirit manifest, as they mark the presence of plenary invisible missions destined to be communicated to others. By recalling that Christ is an author of sanctification, the entirety of his saving mystery is set within the larger scope of the divine missions, a sapiential trait that is passed on to the rest of theology which depends upon Christology. Finally, so as to reconcile the fact that the Son is sent *for our salvation* and the preeminence of God's love *for Christ himself* in his humanity, one must consider these truths from the perspective of God's love and communication. Cooperating with God's communication of his perfection already contributes to the greater perfection and divine participation of the one cooperating with him. Thus, communicating to others does not undermine Christ's humanity—just as it does not undermine God himself—rather the Son of man receives the maximal communication, not only to become the principle of grace, glory, and beatitude, but also inasmuch as he is at the center of the divine missions.

N.V